REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 24, 2005. Claims 1-34 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-34. The present response amends claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 12, 13, 22, 23 and 32-34, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-34. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Sather* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0143815 A1) in view of *Beauchamp* (U.S. Patent No. 6,621,505).

Prima facie obviousness rejection requires the Examiner to show that the prior art alone or in combination teaches or suggests all elements of the claimed invention. *Sather* teaches "representing an XML document as a DOM component" (Abstract, paragraph 0005, line 11-12), which is a data representation method at the upstream of the data processing method of the present invention. In fact, the present invention teaches "parsing an XML document to generate a stream of events" (claims 1, 13, 23, 33, and 34) wherein the XML document has already been represented (via, for a non-limiting example, a method like *Sather*) as a (DOM) tree. Thus, the present invention focuses at a subsequent data processing step of *Sather* and cannot be anticipated by *Sather*. On the other hand, *Beauchamp* teaches "parsing an XML tree to determine how the response should be presented in the user interface" (column 21, line 17-19) by looking up "a hash table with NameValue pairs representing each value as it is presented" when notified by

8

an "event listener" (column 21, line 23-26). In other words, it teaches how to present an XML (DOM) tree on a GUI. Although it utilizes an event listener, *Beauchamp* is a data presentation method at the upstream of the data processing method of the present invention just like *Sather*. In contrast, the present invention teaches a data processing, not data representation or presentation method, which involves the following key steps: 1. "parsing an XML document (tree) to generate a stream of events, wherein each event can represent a portion of the document;" 2. "keeping in memory only a subset of the" stream of events while "performing a match" on the subset of the events; 3. notifying "a user component" when there is "a matched event" (claims 1, 13, 23, 33, and 34). Since neither *Sather* nor *Beauchamp* teaches any of the proceeding steps for parsing of an existing XML tree to generate a stream of events, keeping only a subset of the events in memory while performing matching on each of them, and processing only those matched events, they cannot render independent claims 1, 13, 23, 33, and 34 obvious. Since claims 2-12 depend on claim 1, claims 14-22 depend on claim 13, claims 24-32 depend on claim 23, *Sather* in view of *Beauchamp* cannot render claims 1-34 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: ___5/2/05___   By:_____

David T. Xue
Reg. No. 54,554

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
Customer No. 23910

10